

4  
**SPEECH OF MR. CLAYTON,**

*OF DELAWARE,*

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEB. 10, 1831,

ON THE

**RESOLUTION OF MR. GRUNDY,**

TO PROHIBIT THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE  
MANAGEMENT OF THE

**POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,**

FROM INVESTIGATING

THE PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH THE REMOVALS HAVE BEEN MADE IN  
THAT DEPARTMENT.

---

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL JOURNAL.

—  
1831.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries



# **SPEECH OF MR. CLAYTON,**

## **OF DELAWARE.**

**IN THE SENATE U. S.—FEB. 10, 1831.**

**On the resolution of Mr. GRUNDY to prohibit the Select Committee on the management of the Post Office Department from investigating the principles upon which the removals have been made in that Department.**

**Mr. PRESIDENT :**

It is with unfeigned reluctance that I rise for the purpose of again engaging in a discussion of the resolution of the honorable gentleman from Tennessee. Laboring as I do at this time under considerable indisposition, it would be much more agreeable to my feelings, if consistent with my sense of duty, to suffer those who originated this debate to "form their political text-book for the year," as the gentleman from Indiana has phrased it, without any attempt on my part to mar its beauties or correct its errors; but the remarks which I had the honor to address to the Senate on this subject have been so grossly perverted, and the real state of the funds of the Post Office Department as they appear from the documents before us, has been so incorrectly represented by the Members from New Hampshire and Tennessee, (Messrs. WOODBURY and GRUNDY,) that I am again compelled to trespass upon the indulgence of this honorable body.

Before I proceed to discharge this necessary duty, suffer me, sir, briefly to notice an observation which fell from the Member from Missouri, (Mr. BENTON,) in the course of a debate on the salt tax, originated by him, and which you then pronounced to be disorderly. He was pleased to say, that the Senate ought not to deny him a hearing on his important motion to abolish the duty on alum salt, while they so willingly consented to this investigation, "which engaged them as petty constables in ferreting out crimes of which they might afterwards become judges." There was nothing, sir, in the source from which this sprung, in the manner in which it was made, or in the occasion which gave it birth, that would have entitled it to *any* notice from me, but for the repetition of the argument involved in it, that the Senate ought not to inquire into impeachable matter. That argument, sir, has been urged by the Senator from New Hampshire, and supported by the gentleman from Tennessee, to deprive the Committee of the power of ascertaining the principles upon which your Postmaster General has removed so many hundreds of officers from his Department. If it has not been sufficiently met and answered already, it was because such an argument was not deemed worthy of any labored reply. It is not every hypocritical pretence which ingenuity can resort to for the purpose of screening guilt or condemning innocence—not the whine of every sycophant that bends before power, and who



would prostrate the dignity of the Senate while he affects to mourn over its fall, that merits an answer from me. But to the gentleman from Tennessee, who represents the highly respectable Legislature which elected him, and who doubtless thinks there is weight in this objection when he presses it, I answer that the object of the whole inquiry, as expressed on the face of the resolution, under the authority of which he and I are acting as Members of a Committee, is *to enable us to legislate*; that it was not instituted to lay the foundation for any impeachment: that the right which the Senate enjoys as a co-ordinate branch of the whole legislative power of the Union, involves the right to inquire into any and every abuse in all the Departments of the Government which legislation can reach, and which Congress ought either to limit or prevent. The power to inquire whether a law be necessary, must be incident and subsidiary to the power to make it.

His reasoning to screen the Postmaster General from this investigation proves too much. It would prevent us from examining the conduct of all those subordinate officers of this government who are as liable to impeachment as the President or Chiefs of Department. The gentleman from Maine has justly remarked, that the Senate is for some purposes a judicial, for others an executive, and for others a legislative body. It exercises all the powers incident to each of these capacities independently of the others. Was it ever heard that the Senate forbore to counsel and advise the President in their executive character, because they might thereby prejudge matters which, by possibility, might afterwards be submitted to them as legislators? Should we refuse to hear a word to convince us of the necessity of passing an act to prevent, by increasing the penalties for, extortion in our public officers, because we *might* be called upon to try them as judges? Did we refuse to decide in our judicial capacity a question of contempt, because such a bill as has since been introduced, to regulate the law of contempt, might be brought before us? The argument, if it deserve the name of one, would subvert the power and obstruct the whole action of the Senate. In all such cases the objection of prejudging is met and crushed by the antagonizing consideration, that our duty to the people, and our oaths to support the *magna charta* of their liberties, require of us to close every avenue against the possible abuse of power, and to expose and restrain every encroachment upon their rights. Sir, there are, perhaps, a hundred cases appearing on our records, in which inquiries have been made here into abuses of the government, for the purposes of legislation; and it is not too much to say that this is the first time, in the history of this body, when such an objection has been advanced to screen a public officer from a fair and full investigation of the principles which have regulated his official conduct. It is no less striking than novel, too, that the friends of the Postmaster General should betray such great sensitiveness, *lest the examination of the Committee should lead to his impeachment*. When that Committee was appointed in the early part of this session, it was vauntingly urged by his friends here, that they defied the investigation, and courted the inquiry. Their cry was, "none but the galled jade winces"—"Examine every thing and you will find all right." The original resolution directing the inquiry into the *entire management* of the Department, was adopted with an air of triumph, though the anxiety to avoid the scrutiny of a Select Committee did not very well comport, as I thought then, sir, with the lofty and sounding phrases which accompa-



ained it. When the trial begins, we see that a new light is suddenly shed on the question then decided. A part of the power which was delegated to the Committee must be now revoked. The light begins to shine too brightly, and the cry is, we are afraid you will disclose impeachable matter. In other words, the fear is that the Postmaster General has so grossly violated the law and the constitution, that if we suffer your Committee to examine his principles of official action with a view to restrain him, we may be compelled to try him on an impeachment! I will not deny this, sir, because it has doubtless been permitted to these gentlemen to learn much more of the secrets of his Department than myself; and, as I do not love to contradict gentlemen when I can avoid it, I agree that the apprehensions they express may be well grounded. If the proof be not arrested, a scene of barter and juggling for office may be disclosed, the like of which never before disgraced this or any other country. It may be, that the people will stand aghast at it, and every honest man of the political party which has elevated this Chief of this Department to his present station, shall view this scene of political corruption with horror! Does the Department cower under these charges, sir? Does it, in the face of an honest, but deluded people, still shun the light under the hypocritical pretence that we cannot inquire into impeachable matter!—Yes, sir, it dare do *this*; and it has found a supporter here, who, while he expresses his fears, that we are ferreting out *crimes* of which we may afterwards become judges, denounces us as petty constables for our trouble. Yet, be it remembered, that this comes from the Chairman of the Committee on executive patronage, and as the Senator from Maine, who was a member of it, has alleged without contradiction in the debate here, from the very author of the report of that Committee, which in 1826 examined *every* Department of the government for abuses, and reported six bills to check the current of executive power, with a voluminous exposition of *facts* and alleged *crimes*, to lay the foundation for legislative interference. Look at the report! One of the bills contains a clause to compel the President to assign the causes for every removal from any office referred to in that bill. It was not only deemed proper *then* to disclose impeachable matter, but necessary to compel that disclosure for executive as well as legislative purposes. *Now*, the very course recommended at that time is right for no purpose. Another of these bills provided that no Postmaster, where the profits of his office amount to a certain sum, shall be appointed to or removed from office but by the President and Senate. The argument in favor of this bill then pressed upon the people, was, that the influence and patronage of the Department were so vast, that it had become one of the “arbiters of human fate” in this country, and could no longer be safely trusted to a single individual. The Committee, instead of telling us they were afraid to ferret out crimes, say they “hold themselves to be acting in the spirit of the constitution, in laboring to multiply the guards, and close the avenues to the possible abuse of power,” and the *impeachable matter* which is *now* so objectionable a feature in this inquiry was *then* so glorious a discovery, that 6000 copies of the report were printed by the Senate, and scattered throughout the country. We see here who were the “petty constables” of *that* day; and if a change of times has not produced a change of principle too, we shall now proceed fearlessly in ferreting out abuses of every description which we can reform or inhibit. If, for doing so, we receive the appellation of petty constables, let us rely for our reward on



the approbation of our consciences and our country, taking care to merit no more humble title than that of *honest* constables who never charge double compensation for their trouble.

But it is alleged that this question was decided by the Senate at the last session, when they refused to inquire into the causes which induced the President to sweep the list of civil officers, and the aid of precedent is invoked to effect a suppression of this investigation. Sir, I am not aware that this Senate has, in the gloomiest period of subserviency to executive will, decided the abstract principle, that even the President is above the law, or that his principles of action, while administering the constitution, are not liable to investigation. I know well that in the executive sessions during the last year, inquiries in particular cases of removal were repeatedly refused, some thinking the inquiries inexpedient in those particular instances. The power of the Representatives of the States was held in slight estimation by the advocates of executive influence at that day, it is most true; but even then, no man pretended that all the subordinate officers of the government should be covered with the same ægis which protected their chief. The argument then was, sir, that the President was answerable only to the people who elected him at the polls, and not to their Representatives, a distinction to which I never bowed with any respect, and which I still think is entitled to none. But the chiefs of Department are neither elected by the people nor the States, nor answerable to either in any other way than through their Representatives here, by whom their whole powers are conferred. The Postmaster General, like the rest of these chiefs, is an officer unknown to the constitution, and the creature of the law only. Congress enacted the law which constitutes his whole authority for action. It made him. It can repeal that law and unmake him. Upon the very principles conceded by those who sheltered your President from scrutiny, the Chief of this Department is amenable, like every other creature of the law, to his creators. And if not, then is every other executive officer of this government at all times, and under all circumstances, above the very law which established his office. You cannot, on this principle, investigate the conduct of the most petty officer in the customs, without invading the royal prerogative; and the principle that the "King can do no wrong," which even England knows only in theory, is here transferred to every subordinate of the government, until every "petting petty officer" becomes a tyrant amenable to no human tribunal but the will of his political chief.

There does not exist in this Government a Department which by law is held so irresponsible to Congress or the People as the Post Office. It disburses annually, from its own funds, \$1,932,000 among the people, of which \$595,000 is paid to Postmasters, all subject to be removed for a smile or a frown at any moment by its chief. The sum of \$1,274,000 is paid for transportation of the mail to individuals who are equally liable for a smile or a frown to be embarrassed by the regulations of the Department, (such, for instance, as the loss of a single trip,) and driven from its employment. If a soldier of the Revolution apply for a scanty pittance of one hundred dollars per annum, his claim must be scrutinized, and the will of Congress, tardily expressed, must sanction the compensation, or it is lost. But how many thousands are disbursed by the Chief of this Department at his will, under the name of extra compensation to contractors and officers, of which no account is rendered to Congress or the people! The items composing this immense expenditure of 1,274,000



dollars are no where laid before the public, and it is alleged that in the disposition of it the grossest abuses of unrestrained power have been committed. What check—what control do you, can you now exercise over this vast disbursement of the public treasure? Is there any Department, of this or any other Government, whose means of controlling public opinion are so ample, that is subject to no check or limit? A nod from its Chief now creates at any moment a new clerk with a salary of a thousand or fifteen hundred dollars, or drives him from office, and you are not even consulted as to the propriety of the measure; nay, you remain in utter ignorance of the fact, for the annual report does not condescend to give you a single item in the whole mass of these disbursements. In addition to all this, more than \$63,000 are annually paid away under the head of “Incidental Expenses” at the will of this Chief of a Department, and there is not a man on this floor who can state the number and the substance of even the principal items which compose it. All that you know of it is, that in the report a part of the mighty expenditure of nearly *two millions of dollars*, which this Department annually lavishes upon twenty-six thousand officers and agents, is stated to be composed of “Incidental Expenses!” Sir, is it possible that it can escape a thinking intellect, how easy a part of these immense sums might be paid away to a hireling agent for an electioneering tour, under the pretence of public duty? Is it—dare it be denied that there are secret agents in the employment of this Chief, whose compensation, defrayed out of the public purse, is regulated by his sole control, and whose services are never made known to the people or their Representatives here? Yet, in addition to all these expenditures, the Department draws annually *from the Treasury* the sum of \$61,291, to pay the salaries of certain officers and agents, and what are called “contingent expenses” of the Department, making the whole actual annual disbursement of \$1,993,993.95. But to crown the climax, Congress is now asked (and a bill lies before me which has actually been reported for the purpose) to increase the pay of the present officers to an amount never known before, by more drafts on the Treasury, and to authorize the present Postmaster General *to create as many new clerks as he pleases*, each with a salary of \$800 per annum, to be paid *not from the funds of the Department*, but from the Treasury!\* Is it not right to inquire then for what specific objects these expenditures have been made, why the same labor which was performed by the old officers cannot now be done for the same compensation, and upon what principles the Department has been regulated in constituting the recipients of its bounty, or removing the objects of its aversion?

It so happened, sir, that in the course of the few remarks which I yesterday found it necessary to submit, in reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, who introduced this resolution, and commenced this debate, I entered into some calculation of the state of the available funds of this Department. I did so, as I then distinctly stated, with a view to explain the causes which had induced this investigation, and to exhibit the necessity of ascertaining the truth or untruth of what public rumour had most confidently alleged—that the declension of the public treasure there was owing to the removal of so many experienced and faithful agents.—

\* On the 26th February, the Department sent into the Senate an estimate for extra Clerk hire, amounting to \$20,000, which was inserted in the appropriation bill, and makes the draft on the Treasury to sustain the Department this year \$31,000.



To this course, sir, that unflinching champion and advocate of the Department, the gentleman from New Hampshire, has taken great exception. He chooses to assume that I, by the mere statement of what appears on the official records, (for I did nothing more,) have charged the Department with corruption and fraud. That is a result, sir, to which I might arrive by the aid of that evidence, which the honorable gentleman has refused to suffer the Committee to hear. I would not prejudge the whole case, however, while I rejected the testimony, or before it was heard. But if the charge of an expenditure unprecedented in the annals of the Department necessarily implies, as he seems to consider, a charge of fraud and corruption, then, sir, that charge is sustained by evidence, which twenty times his force can neither suppress nor discredit. The official report shows the amount of expenditures for the last year to be \$150,574 38 *more* than was ever expended in any previous year. To counteract the effect of this single fact, the Member from New Hampshire boasts that the receipts of the Department have exceeded those of the preceding year by the sum of \$300,000. Now, sir, he who affects with such an air of triumph, to call my attention to "dates and figures," should be a little more careful in reference to them himself. The great difficulty with this sounding declaration is, that it is not true. The Postmaster General's own report, in the first ten lines of it, proves how miserably the Member is mistaken. The receipts for the last year were \$1,850,580 10. Those of the preceding year were \$1,707,418 42, and the difference in the receipts is \$143,164 68. The receipts for the year ending the 1st of July, 1828, were \$1,598,877 95, a sum which is less than that for 1830, by \$251,705 15 only. When the gentleman, in the excess of his zeal to lavish encomiums on the Department, only *doubled* the real excess of revenue of 1830 over that of 1829, and supposed he was thereby casting the predecessor of Mr. Barry into the shade, we must in charity suppose that he had forgotten that the real ratio of increase of revenue since the latter came into office, had fallen short of that of former years. I do not suppose, sir, that he wilfully stated \$143,000 to be \$300,000. But I do suppose that *some one* had informed him that this statement was correct. The fact is, the increase was 2 per cent. less than usual. In a country where the increase of population is so rapid as in ours, where the demand of all classes for intercourse through the mail is constantly growing, the revenue for postage must, and will if proper attention be bestowed upon it, annually increase in a corresponding ratio, and a Postmaster General whose advocate can rest his pretensions to public confidence upon no better evidence than *that* increase which must be inevitable, affords but slender cause for that advocate to shout victory before the battle is begun.

In connexion with this subject, the Member then proceeds to reply to my remark, that, from the statement of the Postmaster General himself, the Department is unable to meet the public demand for post routes, and that if that statement be true, unless some change should occur in the administration of its affairs, it would soon reach the period of its bankruptcy. Now, sir, to substantiate my position, suffer me to refer the Member to a few passages in only two of Mr. Barry's communications to Congress which cover the whole ground. In March, 1830, he writes to the Committee on Post Offices and Post roads of the other House, as appears by the printed report of that Committee in vol. 3 of the reports of the House of Representatives, No. 361, that on the 1st day of April, 1829, the



available funds of the Department amounted to \$280,065, being the sum which he thus admits Mr. McLean had left after paying all the expenses of the Department during his administration,\* and at the same time he admits that during all former periods of its history "all the expenses of transportation and others incident to this Department have been defrayed by its own resources, without any appropriation, at any time, to meet them, from the Treasury." But in addition to this, he admits that Timothy Pickering, Joseph Habersham, Gideon Granger, Return J. Miegs, and John McLean, had actually *paid into the Treasury* of this nation, the sum of \$1,103,063, no part of which had ever been drawn by the Department, but which had remained in the Treasury to augment the revenue and strengthen the arm of the Government. Then in the same document, he informs the Committee that "*now* the greatest possible frugality is necessary in the management of the concerns of the Department, and without any considerable improvement in mail facilities for, it is believed, at least three years to come, *to make the Department sustain itself in its present operations*, without ANY increase in the number of mail routes!" He proceeds to inform them that the two hundred new mail routes then called for, would cost \$86,000, (the Treasury of course to pay for them, as the Department could not,) and concludes the paragraph by saying, "It is not, however, apprehended that the *existing* state of the Department, and a continuation of the accommodations already in operation, though its expenses, for the present, greatly exceed its current income, will require any assistance beyond what will arise from its progressive increase of revenue; but, as before stated, with adequate vigilance, the resources of the Department are believed to be equal to its *present* exigencies." Here then we see, that in March last, such was the embarrassment of the Department, that for the first time in the history of its administration its funds were equal only to its then *existing* exigencies, without a cent to defray the expense of the mail routes which were called for from all parts of the country. Before that time we all know that "all the expenses of transportation were defrayed (and promptly too) from its own resources." Then it could only, by great frugality, "sustain itself in its present operations," without being able to pay for any new mail routes or mail facilities for *three* years to come! After this, sir, comes the important question, *have the funds of the Department increased since the date of this document?* So far from it, your Postmaster General, in his last annual report, tells you that since that time and during the year ending on the 1st day of July, 1830, its expenditures have exceeded its income \$82,124 85, and the \$280,000 which his predecessor had left were then reduced down to \$148,000.—From the Postmaster General's answer to a call of the other House made last year to ascertain the excess of expenditure which occurred in *the three last quarters* of Mr McLean's administration, it appears that the excess for the first quarter of the new administration which commenced on the 1st of April, and ended on the 1st July, 1829, was \$32,000,

\* Mr. McLean, in his communication to the Committee, dated February 26, 1831, states that when he left the office the surplus funds amounted to \$289,140 17, making \$9,000, more than the amount stated by Mr. Barry. He also states the whole amount of the excess of expenditures above the receipts from July 1, 1828, to April 1, 1829, to have been but \$39,312 90, including \$5,832 15 expended for the new Post Office building, which he says ought to have been a charge on the Treasury. Mr. Barry states this excess during the same time, at \$42,863 95. See 4 vol. state papers 1st Session, 21st Congress, document No. 118.



which, added to the \$82,000, the excess for the ensuing year, shows that in the first fifteen months of his administration, the funds of the Department were reduced \$114,000. I commend the gentleman of "dates and figures" to an examination of these stubborn facts, and when he has learned them I may pray his opinion on the question, whether from the records before us the Department is not verging to insolvency and already rendered inadequate to the purposes of its creation. Sir, he and his friend from Tennessee may paint *an inch thick*, yet to this complexion it must come at last, unless they mean to contend that the Postmaster General has either wilfully or ignorantly misrepresented the state of the funds—and I leave them to choose which branch of this comfortable dilemma may to them appear most expedient to hang upon in his further defence.

At the same time, sir, let me by no means be understood to admit that the present Postmaster General's statement of the available funds left by his predecessor is correct. His predecessor stated the amount of these available funds to have been, on the 1st day of July, 1828, 332,000 dollars, after deducting all desperate accounts. But his successor, in his report to Congress, reduces this sum (by deducting for losses *since ascertained* and for expenditures) to \$280,000, on the 1st day of April, 1829. Whether this does not exhibit these funds at the time his predecessor left the office in an unfair light, yet remains to be ascertained.—What these newly discovered losses consisted of, whether they had not been previously taken into the estimate by his predecessor—and upon what principle that estimate was made, all remain to be examined, and I hope we shall ascertain them yet, although the gentlemen from Tennessee and New Hampshire have, as we have seen before, refused to hear the evidence of the Solicitor of the Department on this important branch of the subject. If these funds have been incorrectly represented to Congress by the present Postmaster General, I shall not stop to inquire whether his diminution of them was made with a view to disparage his predecessor, upon whose official reputation he evidently put a slight estimate in his first report, nor whether he purposes to place the sum he has deducted from Mr. McLean's estimate futurally to his own credit as a financier; but if the funds do *exist*, in spite of his report to the contrary, why do all his friends in both Houses oppose the passage of the post route bill, on the ground that he has not the money to defray the expense of establishing the routes?

But further, Sir—My position being fully sustained by the Postmaster General's own statements, I ask the gentlemen who undertake to decide the matter referred to us in his favour before the investigation is begun, *why is it*, that now, for the first time in the history of the Department, it is unable to defray the expenses of mail transportation on the new routes which the public have demanded by their petitions here, and which have swelled to about three hundred? It was boasted by the gentlemen, that the Postmaster General had collected more revenue last year, than was ever obtained before in a single year. And the member from Tennessee dwelt with heartfelt delight upon the fact that the present Postmaster of this city, who was appointed to fill the vacancy occasioned by the removal of Mr. Monroe, had collected a larger sum in a given time, than the latter did in the corresponding time preceding it. This, sir, with deference to the gentleman, is so *small* a business, although the Postmaster General has, as we see, found a friend here to make the call for the information with a



view to effect, that I should not notice it but for the imputation attempted to be cast upon the excellent officer who was removed. Here, as in all other cases where a victim has been singled out for proscription, the effort of the Department is to destroy his reputation. And yet this statement of the Postmaster General has never been printed, nor in any other way has the proscribed officer been notified of the intended attack. But, saying nothing at this time of the truth of the statement, and leaving that to Mr. Monroe himself, who will defend himself against this or any other imputation, we cannot but reflect that in every growing town or city, a concurrence of fortuitous and co-operating circumstances often produces a much greater revenue in one year than that of the preceding one. In 1829, when the new Postmaster was appointed, this City was thronged with thousands of visitors and applicants for office, whose letter postage, in addition to that which the rapidly growing prosperity of the City produced, must have constituted a formidable item for the Postmaster General to exhibit, in contrast with that of the preceding year. I shall not stop to estimate postage on office-hunting letters at that day. The gentlemen on the other side have far better means of judging of this.—Doubtless it was enormous. Nor shall I point the attention of the gentlemen to the many cases in which the revenue has declined, after the removal of good officers. But as this, and all like items, are embraced in the whole mass of revenue for the year, I answer all vaunts of this kind from the Department, by inquiring in turn—What have you done with the money? You tell us that you have expended about two millions of dollars, and abstracted from the funds in one year eighty-two thousand dollars besides. How have you disbursed this immense sum? And if your inability to comply with the public demand for mail routes, presenting, as you admit it does, an unexampled state of embarrassment in the administration of this branch of the public revenue, be not owing to the improper dismissal of meritorious officers, and the substitution of inefficient ones to fill their places, to what cause do you ascribe this state of things?

To this important question the gentlemen reply, first—that it is to be ascribed to the increased mail facilities which have been established; and they quote from the last report, that from the 1st day of July, 1829, to the 1st day of July, 1830, the transportation of the mail was increased in stages equal to 745,767 miles, and on horseback and in sulkies to 67,104 miles. Admit this statement to be strictly true, yet they should have remembered that similar mail facilities have always been granted before; and they also should have read to us so much of the same report as states that “it is in part owing to these improvements that the amount of *revenue* is so much augmented.” The necessary effect of these very improvements must be to increase the amount of postages, and to defray, if not all, at least a very large part of their expense. But if they had proved a dead loss to the whole amount of their cost, it would not account for one half of your expenditure. We are told in the same report the average expense of transportation by horse or sulky is five cents per mile, and by stages thirteen cents per mile in the southern division. Now, suppose these improvements, which have “so much augmented the revenue,” did augment it to an amount equal to one half their cost, and suppose that every mile of this increased mail transportation in stages cost thirteen cents instead of eight cents, (the mean difference between the cost of that mode of transportation and the transportation by horses and



sulkies,) the expense of the whole 745,767 miles is but 96,949 dollars and seventy-one cents ; and then adding 3,355 dollars and twenty cents for the 67,104 miles of transportation by horses and sulkies, at five cents per mile, the whole expenditure is but 100,304 dollars and 91 cents ; and the one half of this we have supposed is paid by the increase of revenue it has produced ! How does this account for the fact that 150,000 dollars were last year expended beyond the disbursement of any former year, and that since the resignation of Mr. McLean the whole annual revenue has been sunk, and 114,000 dollars drawn from the funds he left ?

But if this excuse be insufficient, say the gentlemen, we have another : There were new post routes established in the time of the predecessor of the present Postmaster General, a part of the cost of which has fallen on the latter. On this subject, sir, I think it can be easily shown that the expense of establishing the new routes alluded to, amounting to something more than two hundred, did not exceed 30,000 dollars. *All the revenue which the routes established by the law of 1828 produced, was received by the present Postmaster General—not a cent of it by his predecessor.* The whole expense of the first quarter after the routes were established, was incurred and paid before the 1st of April, 1829, out of the funds in the hands of that predecessor, forming, therefore, no deduction from the surplus of 280,000 dollars, which was left on the 1st of April, 1829. No law has passed since the present Postmaster General came into office to compel him to establish a single new route. His predecessor established 553, including those enumerated by the act of 1827, paid the expenses of them all without calling on the Treasury for a dollar, and left more than 280,000 dollars in the Department ! During all this time too, there was a corresponding increase of mail facilities of every description. The following statement will show how little in his day the funds of the Department were affected by such causes as are now assigned for their unprecedented decline :

By the act of the 3d of March, 1823, and 3d of March, 1825, 279 new post routes were established, of which 214 were included in the last act. From the 1st of July, 1823, to the 1st of July, 1824, the transportation of the mail was increased 495,118 miles, of which 374,270 miles consisted of stage transportation—the cost of all which Mr. McLean estimates at 30,000 dollars in his report of 1824. By the report of November, 1825, it appears that from the 1st day of July, 1823, to the 1st day of July, 1825, the increase of mail accommodation amounted to 1,528,821 miles, and during the same time, 1,040 new post offices were established. “ Yet,” says the report of that day, “ such has been the accession of receipts for postage, that the additional expenditure required by this extension of the mail will be met without difficulty ; and if Congress should think proper *to relieve the Treasury from all charge on account of this Department, the usual appropriations may be drawn from its own funds.*” In these two years, notwithstanding all these drafts on its funds, so vastly greater than those which have occurred since the 5th of March 1829, at a period when the density and amount of population were far from conferring the same advantages for increasing its revenue which now exist, the whole expense was promptly met by its own funds, and yet there was an *excess* of revenue for these two years of \$29,177 99 ! The report of Nov. 1826, shows an augmented conveyance of the mail, since 1823, of 1,857,345 miles, and an increase of 1,754 new Post-Offices. Yet the revenue was found sufficient for all these expenses, and there



was an *excess* of it in that very year over the expenditures, of 79,160 dollars and 61 cents ! The report of November, 1827, shows an augmented transportation of the mail for the preceding year, of 415,214 miles, in stages ; and on horseback and in sulkies, of 59,032 miles—yet exhibits a surplus of revenue for that year, after paying all expenses, of 100,312 dollars !—But more, sir : In this very report Mr. McLean adds “ that the surplus funds exceed 370,000 dollars ; that the means of the Department are now ample to meet the reasonable wants of the country, and that A VIGILANT ADMINISTRATION OF ITS AFFAIRS FOR A FEW YEARS TO COME, WILL PLACE AT THE DISPOSITION OF THE GOVERNMENT AN ANNUAL SURPLUS OF MORE THAN HALF A MILLION OF DOLLARS ! ”—Yet at this time, sir, when it is not able, by the declarations of its present chief, even to *establish another mail route*, its advocates and champions tell me there has been a most vigilant administration of its affairs !—and I am even taken to task by a *censor morum* here for daring to inquire into its concerns.

I will now close the examination of these excuses for this Department by one more brief statement of its former situation. In the report of November, 1823, it appears that the late Postmaster General had, since 1823, added,

in stage transportation, - - 1,949,850 miles,  
in sulkies and on horseback, 1,658,949 miles,

making an increase of - - 3,608,799 miles,

which improvements were “ accompanied by great increase of expenditure on all the important routes, on many of them the mail being then conveyed at the rate of one hundred miles a day ”—yet the amount of the funds during this time rapidly increased, and the surplus left (says the report) was 332,105 dollars and 10 cents. Let it be remembered too that the number of new post routes established from 1823 to 1827, was 553, and they were in the next year *increased to 783*. Now, mail facilities amounting to less than one fourth this amount have sunk the whole annual revenue, and reduced the surplus funds to 148,000 dollars ! But in addition to all this, the demands of this Department upon the Treasury have much increased since 1829. Your appropriation last year was 13,000 dollars more than for the previous year, and 22,940 dollars more than for the year 1824. In these days of *economy*, the old furniture for some rooms in the Department must be *reformed* out, and the appearance of things rendered more suitable to the reigning taste of those who rode into power on the allegation of extravagance in their predecessors.\*

Looking to the reasons pressed with so much earnestness by the gentlemen from New Hampshire and Tennessee, I ask them how they reconcile their argument with the Postmaster General's own statements of his great savings. In his report of November, 1829, (referring to these improvements in mail transportation which they now tell us have sunk the revenue so much,) he says “ the new contracts have been made, including all the improvements, for \$19,195 37 per annum less than the sum paid under the expiring contracts.” If this and the allegation of

\* The appropriation from the Treasury this year, for the Post Office Department, made since this debate, is \$20,000 for *extra clerk hire*, of which \$15,800 is for extra clerk hire since March, 1829. The whole draft on the Treasury to sustain the Department now, being, annually, about \$80,000.



economy which his advocates have made be true, *what has become of the money he found there when he entered the Department?* Sir, these advocates may stifle this inquiry for the present; yet unless they can render some better excuse for the abstraction of these funds than has yet been given, the public *will* say it is owing to a want of skill or a profligate expenditure; and looking back to the day when John McLean administered its concerns, with the aid of all the able and faithful officers who have been since removed, they will demand an inquiry into the reasons which have occasioned their *proscription*, and those who represent them shall not dare to refuse it.

But, sir, I have used, it seems, an unfortunate expression. "*Proscription*" is itself proscribed. The Gentleman from Tennessee with his nine causes of removal complains of the use of the word most grievously.—His delicate organs, and the still more tender sensibilities of the Postmaster General, are not to be assailed with so unseemly a phrase, and he makes a hit at the Senator from Maine for daring to say "*proscription*." Sir, we shall hardly be driven from the appropriate use of the offensive phrase, even though the chief of this Department should be subject to fainting fits at the sound. It is a word of such "*exceeding good command*" that he and his advocates must pardon me if I try how I can speak it in pure emulation of my friend from Maine, to whom the Member from Tennessee, having most exquisite organs to judge between us, but not having yet given me a fair hearing, has awarded the palm for pronouncing it better than any other man in this nation. I say then, in the name of an insulted and abused people, to this Chief of a Department, who has driven hundreds of better men than himself from the public service, that, although his advocate here has forbid our tongues to speak of "*proscription*," yet I would that every victim of his unmerited displeasure might find him when he lies asleep, and holla in his ear "*proscription!*"

"Nay, I would have a starling taught to speak

"Nothing but '*proscription*,' and give it him

"To keep his anger still in motion."

He should be met at his incomings and his outgoings, and every honest man should ring it in his ears until the effects of his *proscription* are properly appreciated by him. And now may I ask the gentleman from Tennessee, whose nerves are so sensitive on this subject, how in his judgment I pronounce the word *proscription*?

[Mr. GRUNDY—exceedingly well.]

Then the honorable Member will, I hope, *hereafter* hesitate to decide before *he has heard all the evidence*. May the good word never be laughed out of countenance by any political wit snapper, who may be displeased by its use. For the present, I fear much that the effect of the vindictive spirit which has actuated this Department may not be properly appreciated, for it has been alleged here, that this *proscription* meets the full approbation of the President, and his name has been used as a political *decantatur*, to hush the inquiry into repose. This sounds the tocsin of party, and invokes the aid of that influence which can at all times successfully suppress truth and propagate falsehood. We may despair in such a contest, and be compelled to acknowledge that if he who presides over the republic has sanctioned all this *proscription*, *we* are too powerless to obtain redress. But it will be soon seen whether there be not *one* man in this nation able to breast its terrors when even the Presi-



ient hurls its thunders. There are hawks abroad, sir. Rumour alleges that the plundering falcon has lately stooped upon a full winged eagle that never yet flinched from a contest, and, as might be naturally expected, all await the result with intense interest. It is given out, that the intended victim of proscription now is one distinguished far above all in office for the vigor and splendor of his intellect.

——— “Micat inter omnes  
“Velut inter ignes luna minores.”

One who has been a prominent member of the party which gave power to our modern Dictator is to feel the undying vengeance which can burst forth after the lapse of twelve years for an act done or a word said in a high official station and under the solemn obligation of an oath. But if that energy and firmness which have hitherto characterized him through life do not now desert him in this his hour of greatest peril, we may yet live to see *one* who has been marked out as a victim escape unscathed even by that power which has thus far prostrated alike the barriers of public law and the sanctity of private reputation. In the mean time, let it not be forgotten that the injuries inflicted by that proscription which levels first at the office, and then at character to justify the blow, is not less severely felt because the sufferer has not moved in a splendid circle. The “beetle that we tread upon may feel a pang as great as when a giant dies;” and looking to the case to which I have alluded, may not the hundreds who have felt the sting of unmerited reproach fairly invoke the sympathies of others who are now made the objects of an attack not less unmerited and unrelenting in its character than that which *their* humbler efforts may have been unable to resist?

Mr. President, however offensive it may be to the members from New-Hampshire and Tennessee to observe that they have played the advocates of the Postmaster General, I must be permitted to repeat that remark in sheer compliment when I see the dexterity and adroitness with which they have defended him. They represent themselves as being in a minority of the committee, when, according to my view, on all *important* questions, they, with the member from Indiana, are certainly in the majority. But these two gentlemen object and cavil at every step we take; they even seek to stifle the inquiry by an appeal to the Senate; and, to crown the climax, they attack the witness who is brought before us, as soon as he makes a disclosure of the indebtedness of the Postmaster General to the government. Nay, they go further—they provoke a debate here in which the committee is involved to the great obstruction of the inquiry, and in the very commencement of that debate they attack the gentleman from Maine violently for daring to ask a question which they are fearful the witness should answer, but which they say is unbecoming and intended to make false impressions. Going beyond the whole question here too, a blow is levelled at all those who wish to obtain light. The very judgment of the Senate, in commencing the inquiry, is impugned. These are the tricks of certain advocates when defending a desperate cause. It is the usual subterfuge of guilt, first to impeach the witnesses, and then to intimidate or denounce in advance the jury and the judges. But *why* and *how* does the honorable member from Tennessee attack Mr. Bradley. In the first place, to introduce the subject he volunteers the new information that the committee has inquired whether the Postmaster General be indebted to the government, and states a case in reference to which the Senate ought not to



be called on to form any opinion until the evidence is before us. He says Mr. Fowler of Kentucky had given a bond as Postmaster in which Mr. Morrison and others were sureties; that afterwards Mr. Fowler gave a new bond, in which Mr. Barry was a surety; that while Mr. Meigs was Postmaster General the first bond was given up by Mr. Meigs, or, as the honorable gentleman was pleased to insinuate, by *Abraham Bradley, the Assistant Postmaster General*, and he denounces the giving up of this bond as the greatest enormity that ever occurred in this or any other country. He even volunteers as a witness, and gives *hearsay* evidence in behalf of the distressed Postmaster General, whose cause, it seems, already requires all kinds of evidence to help it out. Now, sir, I must acquit the honorable gentleman from Tennessee of any design *wilfully to calumniate* Mr. Bradley. He has been misled by others. I pretend not to impugn his motives in debate, because it would not comport well with what I feel to be due to my station here. But if the Postmaster General has misled the member on this subject, and directed his defence here to be conducted by this stale and miserable subterfuge of attacking the character of the witness in advance, let me tell him in advance he cannot screen himself by such an effort. When the question of his own indebtedness comes to be understood, as it will be by an intelligent public, it will wear a very different complexion from that which the honorable gentleman has represented. But we have not taken half the testimony of this witness, and in this state of the investigation I will not follow the example of the member from Tennessee, by prejudging the liability of Mr. Barry on this post office bond. It becomes my duty, however, to expose the motive of the department for this attack on the witness. The gentleman from Tennessee has mentioned *a certain letter* which Mr. Bradley addressed to the President, and attempts to forestall public opinion on the subject of the contents of that letter. He will pardon me then if I exhibit to the Senate the head and front of Mr. Bradley's offending, premising that his life and character\* have, in the estimation of all men, stood above reproach until the breath of proscription endeavoured to taint it, and that his oath to the truth of the matters stated in this letter was first taken in the committee, after which the letter was rejected and refused to be received as evidence by the majority of the committee, the Senator from Maine and myself dissenting. I ask the Secretary to read the letter.

[The letter annexed was then read.]

You see, sir, from this letter how necessary it is, for the very existence of the persecuting power exercised in this department, that Mr. Bradley should be crushed. If he stands, it must fall. Bradley has fearlessly encountered the strife, though he well knows the fearful odds against him—for he has to struggle against more influence, more patronage, and a spirit more vindictive than exists in any other department of this government. Yet, relying on the justice of his countrymen alone, he bares his head, now grown grey, after more than thirty years faithful public service, before the storm, and defies its vengeance. A private citizen, he can no more be driven from office—on the verge of the grave, he can never expect to be again employed in the public service. Yet, as an honest man

\* Mr. McLean, the late P. M. G. in his letter to the committee of the 26th February, 1831, says, "Respecting Mr. Bradley, I have to state, that from the time I became intimately acquainted with him, I have had the *highest confidence in his integrity*. During my connection with the department, his time was faithfully and assiduously devoted to the public service. In private life Mr. Bradley is without reproach."



and a patriot, he feels it to be his duty, when called upon by a committee of this Senate, to lay bare the transactions of this department; and I will venture to predict, that in future history his character shall stand brightly out, while those of his designing calumniators shall be remembered only to be despised.

It is unnecessary to stop to inquire why the President refused to hear Mr. Bradley in corroboration of the statements contained in this letter, though we know from the oath of the witness that he offered to prove every part of it. If inquiry is *now* to be suppressed, we can readily understand why it was *then* avoided. Some excuse has always been devised whenever investigation has been sought, and, until a change of times, it will always be so. Thus even at this day no answer has been returned by the department to any one of all the numerous interrogatories which the committee addressed to it on the 24th of December last. Yes, sir, nearly six weeks have elapsed, and the receipt of that communication has not *even been acknowledged*. Yet I thought, while on this subject, the member from Tennessee sought to implicate me as chairman of the committee, for withholding communications from the department.

[Mr. GRUNDY here explained, and disclaimed any such expression or intention.]

The gentleman's explanation has saved me some trouble. Yet, sir, it may be well now to put a stopper forever on all such wretched surmises, by making a brief statement of what has occurred. Three letters were addressed to the Postmaster General by the committee—one on the 24th of December last, being the most important, and that which inquired into most of the concerns of his department—another on the 18th, and the third on the 27th of January. That of the 18th of January also contained several important inquiries. Like its predecessor of the 24th of December, it remained unanswered and *unnoticed* until the 31st of January, when the letter of the 27th, inquiring only as to the single point of the Postmaster General's indebtedness to the government, was answered by one letter, in which an attempt was made to throw the blame of the loss of the sum of 10,000 dollars (the amount of Fowler's bond) on Meigs, or some other person, because Morrison's bond had been cancelled and given up to him; and the receipt of the letter of the 18th was barely acknowledged, but *that of the 24th of December*, the most material of all, was entirely unnoticed, although he had been particularly requested to inform us whether he had received each of them. [Here Mr. C. read the letters.] Thus you see, sir, with what justice I complain of the refusal even to notice the receipt of the most essential interrogatories. The acknowledgment in his letter of "interrogatories formerly submitted," admitted nothing as to the letter of the 24th of December, though the gentleman from Tennessee has emphasized the word *formerly*, as if in his opinion that was a recognition of that specific letter. The Postmaster General might now safely deny having ever received that communication, because his expression is fully satisfied by referring to the "*troublesome*" interrogatories in the letter of the 18th of January. After a month's silence on his part, the question was put to him on the 27th ult.—"Have you received the letters of the 24th of December and of the 18th of January? If so, acknowledge it." The answer is—"I have received your letters of the 18th and 27th of January!" It is necessary only to add, that the two brief communications from the Postmaster General, received on the 1st of February, were mentioned to the committee at our first meet-



ing thereafter, on the next day were laid before them, and that their whole contents were fully stated on the day after they were received in the public debate here, which the gentleman from Tennessee introduced.

Now considering this extraordinary state of things, in which we can get no information from the department, is it not surprising that the gentlemen should still insist, when we propose to examine a witness, that we should *inquire first of the department*? A letter was put into my hands by the Senator from Virginia who sits near me, (Mr. Tazewell,) from a citizen of that state, whose character as a most respectable man was vouched for by that Senator. That letter now lies before me. It contains plain, unequivocal charges of "partiality, mismanagement, fraud and corruption," in the southern contracts made during last October for transporting the mail, alleging that higher were preferred to lower bidders without cause, and thus offering to account in part for the waste of the funds. The writer desires that the committee should investigate the matter, and offers himself with the names of some half a dozen other most respectable men, living in Virginia and North Carolina, whom he desires us to send for as witnesses, to substantiate the charges. The letter is laid before the committee. The charges are so strong that it is considered by the committee necessary to ask for power to send for persons and papers. The power is granted by the Senate, and as soon as the committee meet to exercise the power in the very case which induced them to ask for it, the members from Tennessee and New Hampshire, joined by the member from Indiana, (Mr. Hendricks,) resolve that *we shall call on the department*, to see if we cannot find in the Postmaster General's own hands sufficient affidavits and correspondence to substantiate these charges against him; and that, after we have ascertained that we cannot find the proof there, we may send for the witnesses. This is determined when it is certain, from the distance of their residence, that any delay in sending for the witnesses must effectually prevent our obtaining their attendance. At the same time, objections are made to the taking of any depositions. The gentleman from Tennessee and myself are appointed to call on the Postmaster General, to learn if he will not *convict himself* without more proof, and as he (Mr. Grundy) has stated in debate here, whenever I requested him to go, he always informed me *the Postmaster General was sick and could not see us*. So we *did not go*. In the mean time it became useless to send for the witnesses. We were within a few days of the end of the session, and thus, *by a slight exercise of ingenuity*, this part of the investigation was effectually suppressed.

[MR. BENTON here called Mr. C. to order, and insisted that the proceedings of the committee should not be stated in debate.

THE CHAIR decided that Mr. C. was not out of order, and that he had a right to shew the proceedings which had been so often referred to by all the members of the committee who had spoken before him.

MR. BENTON appealed to the Senate.

MR. GRUNDY said, he and all the other members of the committee had commented as fully as they pleased upon the proceedings.

MR. BENTON withdrew his appeal.]

MR. CLAYTON proceeded. It would be well, Mr. President, for all such as wish to suppress debate as well as inquiry to bear in mind, before they attempt it again, that the whole discussion is not one of my seeking, that, like the resolution before us, which of itself discloses some of the



proceedings of the committee, it had its origin with those only who desire to arrest these proceedings. And I will add, that the attempt is but another evidence of that disposition to prevent information on these subjects, which I was proceeding to expose.

It has been stated that when a proposition was made in the Committee to send for Mr. Hand, the Solicitor of the Department, to give testimony as to the state of the funds, the proposition was rejected. This officer has the collection of all the outstanding balances, and of course could have shewn us better than other person what part of these funds are available. He could have produced his estimate of those funds at the time of the resignation of the late Postmaster General, and we should then have been enabled to judge whether the statement in the late reports of losses on these balances *be true or false*. But here was danger, sir. What was the result of the apprehensions it excited? Why it was determined by the gentlemen from Tennessee and New Hampshire, that Mr. Hand should mind his business, and that the information ought to come from the Postmaster General himself. [Mr. C. here read the journal of the Committee on this subject.] Thus you see, sir, while the Postmaster General is withholding all information from us until some few days before the close of the session, when we cannot even examine his communication, we are by the votes of these gentlemen prevented from seeking information from other sources.

I shall not dwell, sir, on the rejection of Mr. Bradley's letter—on the opposition of these gentlemen to his examination—on the numerous objections which they have taken to his evidence at different stages of the inquiry, and which will prevent us from ever closing his testimony, or taking any part of that of many other witnesses who remain to be examined. But I will venture to predict that at the close of the session, and at a moment when it will be impossible for any one to examine his communication, Mr. Barry will report, and not till then.\* But it is my duty, foreseeing as I do this result, and having observed all the shuffling which has occurred, to say now that as no man can be condemned without a trial, so too there can be no acquittal without it.

It has been told us by the gentleman from Tennessee, that should this inquiry proceed, Mr. Barry will refuse to answer it. It may be so, sir.—We have indeed fallen upon evil times. Yet I doubt much whether any chief of a Department *dare* refuse an answer to the Senate while that body retains the spirit to vindicate its rights. And if the day has indeed arrived when our power can be so contemptuously slighted—when we can be braved by every chief of Department or petty Executive officer, it is time that we should leave our seats and suffer the people to send men of sufficient energy to represent them here who will ascertain the means by which every puny whipster gets the sword and defies them to take it from him. Sir, I cannot yet believe that we have fallen so low. It is

\* Mr. Barry's report did not come in until the 1st of March, when, of course, it could not be even read by all the Committee, and it contains no answer whatever to any of the interrogatories in the letter of the 17th January, respecting the number of removals and the practice of removing without notice to the accused—nor any to the question whether the revenue had been anticipated by over-drafts on Postmasters. It offers only an *excuse* for not answering the question in the letter of the 24th December—"What was the state of the funds on the 1st of October last?"—and alleges that the question—"What are the *improvements or other causes* which have caused the increased expenditure of \$150,000 more than was expended last year?"—put to him on the 24th of December last, cannot be answered this session *for want of time*.



true that the Postmaster General did for nearly one whole year omit to notice the resolution of the Senator from Ohio, (Mr. Burnet,) inquiring into the matter of the mail contracts. But after this debate arose, and the refusal to present this answer became the subject of complaint, we find that it has been paraded with much of stage effect on the table before us. The gentleman from Tennessee points to it as a very monument of human industry. It contains, he says, work enough to make a volume.—By examining it, it will be found that three fourths of the whole mass consists of printed bonds and contracts, and the residue of the answer to the inquiry *which the Senator from Ohio made*, might be performed by a tolerable clerk in six weeks. It has not been denied, you observe, that the information as to the contracts of Mr. McLean was last year inserted in the resolution by the request of the present Postmaster General, and his own answer to his own question, made with a view to excuse his own allowances by the example of his predecessor, has caused by far the greater part of the labor which that resolution has imposed. Sir, the Postmaster General may safely send here any information, while the gentlemen from Tennessee and New Hampshire stand ready to protect it from examination. This very mass of labour which it has taken nearly a year to prepare, as the gentlemen would have us believe, after undergoing the careful supervision of all concerned during that time, comes here, and when a motion is made to refer it to this committee, which is examining the subject of these contracts, the gentlemen move its reference to another committee which it was well known did not intend to examine it, and the whole subject is thus snatched from the investigating committee. Strange indeed, that an apprehension should be entertained that in three weeks impeachable matter might be discovered among a mass of papers which they say it required nearly a year to prepare. This, sir, is what I term *stifling inquiry*; and with what countenance these gentlemen can complain of a charge made here that they *have* stifled it after this, let the Senate and the public judge.

And, now, sir, to return to the resolution. It is declaratory of the limits of the commission under which the Committee act, by its very terms. It affirms what is untrue, that *we have no power under our commission, to make this inquiry*. The original resolution directs, as we have seen, an inquiry into the “entire management of the Post Office Department.” Why do not gentlemen say in terms that their aim and object is to *repeal* a part of the powers originally conferred? Why not boldly avow at once, that the boastful defiance of inquiry, at the commencement of the session, when the Committee was appointed, was but an empty vaunt, which it is now found necessary to retract? The gentleman from Tennessee says, that he can supply us with all the information on the subject of the causes of removals. He enumerates nine of these—1st, Intemperance; 2nd, Delinquency; 3rd, Prying into letters; 4th, Concealing or withholding letters; 5th, Habitual negligence of duty; 6th, Incompetency; 7th, Refusal to comply with the regulations of the department; 8th, Discharging the postmasters’ duties by deputies under age; 9th, Living off the post routes. And the honorable gentleman sums up this list of causes with the sweeping declaration, “that he *has no doubt* there has not been a single instance of removal but for one or other of these causes!” Sir, are we to suppose that the Postmaster General instructed him to make such a declaration? The honorable member can know but little on this subject of his own knowledge. He



lives in a district whose political sins have not demanded such expiation as this of removal from office. But we who live north of the Potomac know, sir, that his enumeration of causes is a gross insult to hundreds of our worthy citizens, who have been removed without any other transgression than that which, according to the orthodox creed emanating *ex cathedra* here, is denominated political heresy. In the mean time, sir, this declaration of the gentleman shews us how just were our suspicions, that the files of this department have been filled with groundless accusations against the victims of its proscription, which may sleep there unrefuted because they remain unknown, until in the lapse of time, when the men have been laid in their graves, these receptacles of filth may be opened by the hand of malevolence, to tarnish the memory of those before whom, while living, the accusers dared not shew their faces. His very statement of causes therefore exhibits the strongest reason for demanding an exposition of the facts. But, sir, the blow is not merely levelled at the hundreds of removed postmasters. It strikes directly at their late chief, who retained them all in office. The declaration thus made boldly to the world is, that he kept in office some five or six hundred men, who were either drunken, or were prying into correspondence, or guilty of some other of the enormities enumerated in this list. The answer to it all is, look at the state of the money chest *now*, and remember what it *was* when John M'Lean was compelled to leave it or surrender his independence as a man, and become the tool of this proscriptive and arbitrary power.

But the Senator from Tennessee finds another cause for suppressing the inquiry in what he calls the verdict of the people. The gentleman from Maine had complained of the removal of some twenty-five postmasters in one of the counties of that state. The Senator from Tennessee says he has no right to complain, because the people there have sanctioned the proscription by giving their vote for the administration. Sir, I pretend to know nothing of the case. But I may ask, did the people act with a view to all the subordinate officers of the government, when they merely approved of the general acts of the President? The conduct of these subordinates was probably no part of the issue joined before the people. From the nature of things, we must believe it could not have been so. So far from passing sentence on the removed officers by their vote, the people probably were engrossed by what they deemed more important considerations affecting the general welfare of their country. But, sir, if they had acted with a view to these offices alone, would it have been quite fair to have urged the force of their verdict upon us? It would not sound well, in any supposable case, to offer bribes or threats to *any part* of the jury, and then plead their verdict in justification of the act; and the very evil complained of being the influence of executive patronage on the elective franchise, I do not hesitate to say, without reference to the people of Maine or any other particular state, that if you can find a case which has been decided by the influence of that patronage, you might as well boast that you had embraced a jury, and point in justification to the verdict, as to plume yourselves upon the effect which that patronage has produced. And if the argument has any weight, what shall be said of those verdicts which the people have rendered in other districts of country, where the proscription has been equally extensive, and where, in defiance of your patronage, the decision has been against you?



There is no department of this government, sir, in which the people take so lively an interest as the Post Office. It should be so conducted as to secure their perfect confidence. It should, therefore, have no party character whatever. So anxious was Mr. Jefferson to deprive it of all political connection, as we learn from his memoirs, that he prohibited the employment of any printer in the department, even so far as to be concerned in the transportation of the mail. Suppose that in his day, or that of any former President, it had been charged with operating on the elective franchise and the rights of the states, through the immense influence of an army of dependents, amounting to more than ten thousand men, with subsidizing the press, establishing a system of espionage, and wasting the public treasure in disbursements to political favourites—I ask, would any party, at any former period, have had the hardihood, after an investigation had been set on foot to ascertain the truth of such conjectures, to suppress the investigation, or to restrict it in any particular, for the purpose of preventing a complete developement of all its operations? Yet such charges are now loudly proclaimed against it; such an investigation has been called for, and the very object of the resolution on your table is to close the door against inquiry.

Sir, I have done. In the fearless discharge of my duty here, I may have drawn down on my own head the vengeance of a power, more terrible than any which all the other authorities of this government combined can wield; but I should have proved a faithless representative, and recreant to the interests of the intrepid people who have never yet bowed to the terrors or the allurements of executive influence, if I had shrunk from its performance.

---

The yeas and nays taken on the adoption of the resolution were as follows:

YEAS.—Messrs. Barnard, Benton, Bibb, Brown, Dickerson, Dudley, Ellis, Forsyth, Grundy, Hayne, Iredell, Kane, King, Livingston, Poin-dexter, Robinson, Sanford, Smith of Md., Smith of S. C., Tazewell, Troup, Tyler, White, Woodbury.—24.

NAYS.—Messrs. Barton, Bell, Burnet, Chambers, Chase, Clayton, Foot, Frelinghuysen, Hendricks, Holmes, Johnston, Knight, Marks, Naudain, Noble, Robbins, Ruggles, Seymour, Silsbee, Webster, Willey.—21.

So the Senate resolved to suppress the inquiry “into the reasons which have induced the Postmaster General to make any removals of his deputies.”

---

*Note.*—The following is an extract from the letter of the Hon. John M'Lean to Mr. Barry, laid before the committee by their order;

“*Washington, March 31, 1829.*

“I cannot, in justice to myself and the public service, refrain from recommending the continuance of the Assistant Postmasters General, who have been long identified with the department, and have been faithful to the trust reposed.

“I name those gentlemen to you, because I have understood that efforts are making to remove one or both of them. I should extremely regret such a step, as well on your own account as that of the public. With the operations of the department, I am well acquainted. I am anxious that its reputation shall be sustained, *and I am convinced that this cannot be done if the above gentlemen be removed.* This remark is made with a perfect knowledge of all the facts.”



# LETTER OF MR. A. BRADLEY,

LATE ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL;

*To the truth of the facts contained in which he made oath before the select committee of the Senate.*



CHEVY CHACE, October, 1829.

*The President of the United States.*

SIR : It is not without reluctance and anxiety that I venture to press upon your consideration the subject of the following remarks. I am aware that he who comes forward as an accuser, does not always excite our better feelings; but I am aware also of the rights and duties of a citizen.

I address you as the chief of the nation, as one the aim and object of whose life must be to adorn his station, by a just and impartial execution of the laws which are the safeguard and protection of all, and by a wise scrutiny into the acts, capacity and fitness of those whom you have appointed to administer the details of those great concerns which are of vital importance to all.

Not knowing your particular feelings towards the individual whose conduct and character have furnished the occasion of this address, it may be my misfortune, in addition to the distrust with which such communications are too often read, to have to contend with the predilections of a friend; if so it will occasion me regret, but will not diminish the confidence with which I rely on a patient perusal and mature consideration of what I shall say.

I proceed, sir, at once, to lay before you the following charges and specifications against William T. Barry, Postmaster General of the United States :

CHARGE 1st. That he is indebted to the Government.

*Specification.* In the year 1818, John Fowler, then Postmaster at Lexington, Kentucky, was indebted to the General Post Office. His sureties were applied to—they begged indulgence, proposed to pay a part of the balance then due—that a new bond should be given, and the old one should be cancelled. This was done. The new bond was joint and several.

William T. Barry, now Postmaster General, was one of the sureties in the new bond. Mr. Fowler fell in arrears to a greater amount than ten thousand dollars, which was the amount of the new bond. These sureties had been repeatedly called upon, and at last suit was instituted against them, and among them against Mr. Barry. All this will appear by the books of the Department, and by letters there filed. By the former it will appear that Mr. Barry is now indebted to the United States to the amount of ten thousand dollars.

*Remarks.* It is said that the money paid by Mr. Fowler after the new bond was given, was applied to the extinguishment of the old debt, but should have gone to the credit of that under the new bond.—



And, that the suit against William T. Barry was decided in his favor by the court.

Independent of the known rule of the common law, that when a man is indebted on two accounts, and pays money to the creditor, without directing to which account it shall be applied, the creditor may apply it to which account he pleases, it has been the usage of the General Post Office to apply moneys paid by a Postmaster to the extinguishment of the balance first in order of time, standing against him on the books.

Again; it appears by the certificate of the Clerk of the court in which the suit was brought, that although it was in the first instance decided upon the demurrer by the defendants in their favor, yet the judgment was afterwards opened and the suit dismissed, so that the United States might begin *de novo*; and the indebtedness of the party still remains evident from the books and records of the Department over which he now presides.

**CHARGE 2.** That he has paid money in advance contrary to law, for work *to be done*.

*Specification.* Some time early in the present year, Duff Green made a draft on the Postmaster General for fifteen hundred dollars payable ——. Mr. McLean, then Postmaster General, accepted it, to be paid when printing to the amount should be completed by the drawer, for the use of the Department. The draft was cashed by one of the Washington banks. At maturity it was presented to me for payment. I presented it to Mr. Barry, and stated that nothing of moment was due to the drawer; and that there was a law prohibiting the payment of money in advance, and making it imperative on the President to remove any officer who paid any sum beyond the amount earned or the value of work delivered. Mr. Barry prohibited its payment, and it was refused. I was afterwards informed that he said this was done without his knowledge. I went to him and recalled to his memory the conversation we had had, and that I had followed his direction in refusing to pay it, and then read the law to him; he also read it himself, and said Green was wrong, and it could not be paid.

Not long afterwards it was again presented to Mr. Barry, the Postmaster General; he said something about the law and his engagements to Green, and finally ordered it to be paid—this was done.

*Remark.* The law says in such a case the President shall remove such officer from office. The officer was not ignorant of the law, nor did he misapprehend it; for he had not only refused to pay this in the first instance and confirmed it a second time, but there had been several other instances of a similar character, in which payment had been refused. The books of the Department will show, I believe, four other cases of advances of large sums made by his particular order, but I have no memorandum of them, and one instance is sufficient.

**CHARGE 3.** A disregard to the economy of the public funds under his control.

*Specification.* In the early part of the year 1828, Mr. Harrill, who carries the mail in stages between Georgetown and Charleston, South Carolina, was required by Mr. McLean, Postmaster General, to start from the former place at 3 A. M. instead of 5 A. M., and to arrive at Charleston at 3 P. M. instead of 5 P. M., having in either case twelve hours to perform his route, through a smooth and champaign country.—After having made the change as required, he charged the Department 1,850 dollars a year for three additional teams said to be required in thus



expediting the mail, and demanded that sum. Mr. McLean refused to make the allowance. Harrell procured a representation from several gentlemen to the effect that he had put on three additional teams in consequence of the increased expedition, and that the amount charged was not too high, and a certificate from Mr. McDuffie, that, although he was not acquainted with the facts, he knew those gentlemen were respectable and entitled to full credit. Mr. McLean directed me to return for answer, that as the contractor had the same length of time to perform his route in, the law did not authorize him to make any allowance. Afterwards Mr. Harrell came to the office, applied to Mr. Barry, who directed Doctor B. to write to Harrell that he should be allowed nearly 1,850 dollars for that increased expedition, from April 1st, 1828, until the end of his contract, and ordered the pay to be made for the past year. Thus more than five thousand dollars has been paid or engaged to be paid, without sufficient reason, and contrary to law.

2d. Messrs. Mallets carry the mail from Fayetteville, North Carolina, to Camden, South Carolina. They applied to Mr. Barry for an increased allowance of 550 dollars a year, which he ordered to be made without assigning any reason, which is required by law in cases of increased allowances. Application had been made to the late Postmaster General, but he declined making any, not seeing any grounds or cause for such allowance. I am also informed by my brother, Doctor Bradley, that other increased allowances were made by him to these gentlemen, amounting with the above to three thousand dollars a year, no adequate grounds existing for such allowance. But as I have no access to the books of the Department, I will not make a specific charge of that fact, but merely state it as a subject worthy of inquiry.

3d. The mail is carried between Mobile and New Orleans partly in stages and partly in boats three times a week, and costs six thousand dollars a year.

Applications were made to have this mail carried in steam boats; the distance is called 134 miles. He had it advertised with that view.—Between New York and Albany, 150 miles, the mail is carried six times a week during the season in steamboats for 4000 dollars a year. Between Baltimore and Philadelphia, nearly 120 miles, steamboats and stages daily at 5000 dollars, during the year.

Mr. Barry has made a new contract for this route of 134 miles only three times a week, stipulating to pay twenty-five thousand dollars a year. By this contract the mail will arrive at New Orleans one day earlier than it did before. But there are three other expensive routes leading to New Orleans; these already more than absorb the proceeds of the Post Office, which are less than twenty-five thousand dollars a year. In the four years for which the contract is made, it will cost the public seventy-six thousand dollars more than it would to carry it as it is now carried, and no material advantage is to be gained.

*Specification 4th.* The law requires the advertisements inviting proposals for carrying the mail to be published for twelve weeks, at the seat of Government, and the usage has been to publish them once a week in two papers. The advertisement of this year is a short one, and would have cost for one paper once a week from 600 to 800 dollars. The proprietors of the National Intelligencer publish a daily and tri-weekly paper, and publish the advertisement in the latter several times without any additional charge. But in order to swell the amount, Mr. Barry employed the Telegraph to publish it every time in the daily paper, every time in



the tri-weekly paper, and every time in the weekly paper. Thus the public pays for publishing it ten times a week, in what is in fact the same paper something modified, useless to the public and a nuisance to the subscribers. Shame seemed to restrain the proprietor from taking the full price, and he reduced the continuances after the first three in each paper from 33 cents to 25 cents each square. Still making the whole cost over 2,200 dollars.

5th. He has employed extra clerks and agents when the business of the Office was as well and promptly done before, and when it did not require others; and has expended money in alterations, ornaments and what he considers improvements in the building for the General Post Office, without any appropriation or warrant of law. I cannot specify the extent of the cost; the books of the Office will show.

*Remark.* By these means, through his own indebtedness, and by payments and engagements made without reason, the Department is involved in a loss of nearly 100,000 dollars, and he has been in office but six months.

*Charge 4th.* His ignorance of, and inattention to, the duties of his office.

*Specification 1st.* The power of removing and appointing Postmasters is one of great trust and importance, and requires vigilance, care and judgment

This he had virtually yielded to C. K. Gardiner; before my removal from the office. He is my successor, and I know not how it is now arranged. While in that business the papers relating to one Office were arranged in one bundle, and instead of giving a brief of the charges against the individual, and the answers of the applicants and their supporters, he merely endorsed a suggestion on the papers that such an one should be removed and such an one be appointed, and the Postmaster General endorsed "approved," or "let it be done," or words to that effect. And C. K. Gardiner thus made the removals and appointments.

I would not be understood to state that Mr. Barry never examined the papers, he doubtless did in some instances read them, or a part of them, and the more important appointments were made upon advisement.

2d. I will illustrate the effect of this—The Postmaster at Poughkeepsie, New York, an office of some importance, rendered more so by the interest made for his removal and retention in office, who had opposed the late administration strenuously and advocated the present, had, it seems, voted for his friend Judge Thompson as Governor; he wrote to me repeatedly about the efforts made to remove him. He also wrote to Mr. Barry. I took a letter to me into Mr. Barry's room and told him its contents. "Sir," says he, "we have fully considered that case, he will not be removed—you may write him so." I thought it better, from my knowledge of the manner in which such business was done, to apply to Gardiner. I did so, and found that a new appointment had been made the day before.

3d. For some time he attempted to open the letters addressed to him; a paramount duty, one would think, and to distribute them among his subordinates. He found himself incompetent even to this. While he did attempt it, he did not peruse them farther than to ascertain it was an account, a contract, &c. so that he might send it to somebody who had charge or connexion with the branch to which it belonged.

*Instance.*—On one occasion he received a long letter from a man named Howard, abusing, and I believe preferring charges against me. With



out reading it he sent it to Mr. Coyle, who brought it to me. I advised him to carry it to Mr. Barry and tell him what it was. He did so; Mr. Barry said at first he had never seen it—then that he supposed it related merely to a clerkship, and did not read it. Mr. Coyle asked if he should not show it to me; he said no—he had great confidence in me—it was of no consequence.

*Specification 4th.* His substitute for Mr. McLean's plan of accounting for newspaper postage.

Forms which relate to a business in which more than ten thousand persons are engaged are very material, and should never be changed without great consideration and very clear advantage. They should be brief, plain, and attended with as little expense or labor as practicable.

Under the old form every Postmaster was furnished with a blank account, in which was a column for letter postage, one for newspaper postage, and another for free newspapers; a column for the day of the month, and for the office or mail from whence received. On the arrival of the mail the Postmaster counted the chargeable newspapers at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents, at 1 cent, and number of free, and marked the number and amount on a post bill coming with the mail. Also the same with respect to magazines and pamphlets; from these, when his account was made out, the aggregate were carried out into the columns mentioned in the blank account. This plan was plain, simple, and intelligible. Judge McLean adopted a new plan, and Mr. Barry substituted the following, as nearly as I can understand it:

The Postmasters are, as soon as a mail arrives, to separate the newspapers into as many parcels as there are papers of different names. The name of the printing office, and the number from each, with the rate of postage, is to be set down in an account kept especially for that purpose. There are probably, in the United States, nearly four hundred newspaper establishments. During the Session of Congress, here and at some of the large offices, papers are received from almost every establishment in the country. Supposing papers to arrive only from one half of these, on any one day, it would require the writing of two hundred lines, or four pages of large paper, before the newspapers would be in order for delivery. This would occasion so much delay that the public will not submit to it—it is therefore impracticable. I send herewith the form and instructions, that you may see that it is as unintelligible as it is impracticable, marked No. 1.

It may be wrong to call this Mr. Barry's plan; it was at least adopted by him, and shows his inattention to, if not ignorance of, the details of his office.

*Specification 5th.* His circular to Postmasters.

The first object assigned for its publication, is the embarrassed state of the funds of the Department, and it concludes with the same. And it is to be inferred that that great object, the replenishment of the funds, is to be attained in part by preventing the abuse of the franking privilege, and by carefully charging double, triple, and other letters, to the full extent of the law, and by the non-reduction in cases of excess in those respects, unless the letters were opened in the presence of a Postmaster or his Clerk.

Every one at all acquainted with the subject knows that those abuses never went to any important extent. The President and higher officers of the Government, whatever exuberance there may be in the expressions, will not believe it intended for them. The Postmasters are as a



body men of honor, integrity and standing in society, whose oath of office is a sufficient guarantee against such an abuse.

The second is a strained and improper construction of the law regulating postages. The origin of that law was this: A Postmaster had been threatened with a suit, if he did not abate the postage on a letter delivered from his office, averred to be over-charged, which the Postmaster doubted. He applied to the Postmaster General, Mr. Granger, who directed the abatement; but when the law was revised in 1810 had the clause (misconstrued by Mr. Barry) inserted, in order to protect Postmasters from suits. Such was the construction given to the law at that time, and the practice since. Mr. Barry has, in his circular, made the postage marked on the letter and the post-bill exclusive evidence, whereas the law only makes it conclusive in case of prosecution, the opening in the presence of the Post officer excepted. The Postmasters always exercised a discretion, and denied or granted the abatement as they believed or doubted the man claiming it, or other evidence he might produce.

But the true object of the circular was to convey an idea to the public that the office was distressed and embarrassed in its funds by his predecessor. This was not true, as the books will shew, and Mr. Barry might have ascertained if he had not been ignorant or inattentive to the duties of his office.

*Charge 5th.* His incapacity.

A man in the high and important station of Mr. Barry, has frequently cause to analyze and investigate. I have lent my attention in vain, on various occasions, to discover these capacities, and I cannot doubt that the want of them has frequently been obvious to you. No greater evidence need be given of these deficiencies, than the specifications mentioned under the 3d charge.

I have rarely seen a man occupying any thing more than an ordinary situation in society, so ignorant of the Geography of the country. A Postmaster General uninformed on its topography, a knowledge essential to the office, of the courses and characters of its waters, of the ranges of its mountains, but even of the particular relations of its principal and prominent places to each other, would seem to be equivalent only to something monstrous in natural economy. Yet this might be remedied if he could apply himself, with the zeal, fidelity, and perseverance of his predecessors, to the broad field of the whole country, and not weary himself by a narrow and contracted view of some particular portion of it.

Of some of its important statistics, the population, the character and pursuits of the people in various parts, essential to estimate of the necessity or importance of a mail, and the frequency or expedition with which it should be carried, he is entirely ignorant, and has no quality of the mind suited to the acquisition of such information. His memory is defective, or of a character which I will not offend you by speaking of: he frequently forgets important transactions executed under his immediate direction soon after he has given the order. He cannot even recollect upon what ground the suit against himself on Mr. Fowler's bond was decided. Witness also the refusal of payment to Duff Green, the order to Mr. Coyle, and the Poughkeepsie case. No property of the mind is more essential in such an office as his than this one of memory.

2. He permitted an inferior clerk in the department to devise and write the circular alluded to, and then copied and showed it in his own hand, as his own production.



3. The reasons assigned for the removal of Mr. Hawkins, the postmaster at Frankfort, Ky. is a striking instance of that want of reflection and judgment which have characterized his official life.

For the act he is responsible to you alone, and I do not profess to know the real causes which led to it—I leave it without comment to your decision. But the circumstances arising out of it are material, and although it may require some detail, I must beg, sir, your indulgence while I relate them.

After Mr. Hawkins' removal, Mr. O. B. Brown, one of the clerks of the department, but on a different branch of business, directed a clerk whose duty it was to make out statements of postmasters' accounts for suit, to make out that of Mr. Hawkins. In execution of this order, he met with the usual mark of a draft for a considerable amount credited in pencil to Mr. Hawkins; and as he doubted, not finding in whose favour the draft was made, he applied to Mr. Brown for instructions. Brown directed him to omit it, and to make out the account as posted in ink. Johnson did so. Brown directed him to bring it to me for my signature, and upon Johnson's answer to my inquiry it was all correct, I signed it. Johnson gave it to Brown, who forwarded it to the Fourth Auditor of the treasury, who, as he says, put it into the hands of the Marshal for suit. There is in the office a lawyer, who is charged with the duties of a solicitor for the office, for all the debts of persons whose employments have ceased. All this Mr. Barry was privy to. Afterwards I discovered the account was erroneous, and conferred with Mr. Barry on the subject. The whole of this seems to have been a device of Mr. Barry and Co. to justify the removal of Mr. Hawkins, by making him appear a great debtor, and that it was necessary to the security of the public to sue him immediately—thus wielding the public force for the gratification of his revenge. It was with difficulty I persuaded him to let it rest until time should be given to adjust the accounts, to furnish him with a copy as in other cases, and to make a call for payment. I could not persuade him to agree that a draft should be made for the amount. But he insisted he should pay by a deposit in a bank thirty miles distant, and otherwise inconvenient, upon a short notice: and yet he not only retained Mr. Brown in high favour, but rewarded him with the appointment of Chief Clerk. If he had reflected, and had not wanted judgment, he must have been sensible that this was a device, the effect of which, when exposed, would be injurious to himself and to the government. He compromised his own dignity and his official station by permitting the Fourth Auditor to interfere in the concerns of his department. He inflamed the minds of Hawkins' friends, he weakened the public confidence in the department over which he himself presided, he alienated others from the government, by exhibiting false causes for removing an officer under his control. Taking all these things in connexion with his advance to Duff Green, his allowances to mail contractors, his employment of agents and clerks, and his Mobile contract, and I think the charge is fully sustained.

**CHARGE 6TH.** His want of Integrity and Veracity.

*Specification 1st.* On the 10th of June last, Mr. Barry came into my room for a check for his salary, and without any previous remark leading to the subject said, "I am surprised to find by the receipt of letters almost every day, from almost every quarter, wishing your continuance in office, that an apprehension has gone abroad that there was an intention to remove you. I can assure you that I have long been advised of your faithful services, and such a thing as your removal has never once entered my



head. You may be assured that your continuance in this office will be as permanent as my own. That is, I have no suspicion that any adequate cause will arise—for that there may be exception. You therefore may be perfectly easy on that account." These assurances were repeated through others, as I was advised, by his direction. And from his department and language I had no reason to doubt them, until I received the following note:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, 14 *September*, 1829.

"SIR: I have appointed Col. C. K. Gardiner my Assistant and no not require your services any longer in this Department.

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

W. T. BARRY.

"Mr. A. BRADLEY. Present."

On the 15th September, he requested my son "to assure me that he had the highest respect for me, and the utmost confidence in me."

*Specification 2.* Mr. Coyle had been Chief Clerk in the Post Office Department, and was removed to make room for the author of Mr. Barry's circular. After his removal he published several letters addressed to Mr. Barry. The latter informed my brother that two of the Clerks in the Office had undertaken to answer Mr. Coyle. The second of these answers contained a side attack upon me. As soon as Mr. Barry came to the Office the morning after its publication, I told him it was an entire misrepresentation of facts as it respected both of us. The case was this—Mr. Scott, a Clerk in the Office, had been very ill last year. He came to the Office late in the fall excessively pale and emaciated; and stated that his illness had impoverished—he had spent all that he had—anticipated all he could—winter was fast approaching—he was destitute of food, proper clothing and fuel; that while the salaries of other Clerks of his standing had been raised to 1000 dollars, his had not been raised. Judge McLean concluded to make him an allowance of 100 dollars, which I paid him.

A list of Clerks and their accounts was made out for Mr. Barry, and that sum nearly appeared against Mr. Scott. He died leaving his widow in great distress; her friends applied to Mr. Barry to pay up his salary to the end of the month, which he directed should be done. Mr. Coyle applied to me in behalf of the widow for the pay. I showed him the balance, and told him it could not be paid until it was squared—advised him to apply to Mr. Barry for an order for the proper credit, and to state the subject distinctly. He returned, *said Mr. Barry had directed him to make the credit.* I asked if he was sure he understood it. He said he appeared to do so. I told him I would go myself, two witnesses were better than one. *Mr. Barry denied having given the order.* I then stated the case fully, as far as I recollected it at the moment. He told me I might tell Mr. Coyle to enter the credit. Instead of this, I called him in, and Mr. Barry gave the direction to him again. *Mr. Coyle made the entry agreeably to this order.*

The answer charged the payment as being made in advance, (intended for me,) and a credit by Mr. Coyle as an act out of his line of duty and for base motives, without any authority from the Postmaster General. After recalling these facts to his memory, Mr. Barry said if I would write a note to him in explanation he would have it published. I pre-



pared a note expressed in the mildest form, with which he appeared pleased. A few hours after he informed me Mr. Green declined publishing any more on the subject.

*Specification 3.* His conduct in relation to my removal.

On the 14th September last, soon after I went to my office in the morning, a servant placed upon my table the note a copy of which I have already presented to you, dismissing me in a very uncourteous manner from my office. In a few minutes after I had read the note, the servant came and informed me it was left by mistake, and Mr. Barry wished its return. Not long after he returned again with the note, and said "Mr. Barry says it is of no consequence as you have read it—he did not intend to send it until evening." I immediately put up such of my private papers as were convenient, and retired. In the course of the day, some of my friends called at my house and strenuously advised me to tender the keys of the Post Office Treasury to Mr. Barry, they being apprehensive, unless it was done, I might be attacked in the Telegraph; that my old friends were too much shocked to do much work, and this might be attributed to my having the keys, &c. Under these circumstances I was induced to have the keys offered to Mr. Barry, the moneys being untold, not imagining he would accept them. He did take them, and the same evening delivered them to my successor.

I reflected on the subject, and it seemed so reckless of my own character to run the risk of his accepting them in such a circumstance, that the reflections, you may be assured, were unfavorable to sleep. As soon as the morning dawned, I sent a duplicate key, (which had been overlooked,) to my sons in town, requesting them to go as soon as the Office was opened, count the money and deliver it over to Mr. Barry. My eldest did go to the Office for that purpose; after waiting there until half past eleven o'clock, he went to Mr. Barry and told him it was my request that he should count and deliver over the money, and delivered him the duplicate key. Mr. Barry replied it is all perfectly right.

Thus, Mr. Barry, instead of refusing the keys, as he should have done, took them; instead of retaining them in his own possession until he saw me or some one in my behalf, put them into the hands of a person of whom I will not permit myself to say one word, and to my authority to my son to count and deliver over the money to him, gave an evasion.

On the 19th, a clerk called upon me, and proposed to count the money, on the 22d, that is after it had been in their possession eight days. On the 25th of September, I received a note from two of the clerks, stating that they were directed to give me notice that they were authorized to count the money on the 28th, that is after it had been out of my possession fourteen days nearly; of these I took no notice. I conceived it to be a mockery and an insult to send notification after the answer Mr. Barry had given, through my son. Yet, notwithstanding all this, Mr. Barry authorized the publication of a vile paragraph in the Telegraph of the 28th September, giving a false coloring to the transaction, and not alluding to the interview between my son and himself on the 15th September, in which he was informed that I desired the money might be counted that morning.

I stand prepared to make good every charge and specification I have presented to you: That he is indebted to a large amount to the very Office over which he presides; that he has wasted the public funds; that he has paid money in advance contrary to law; that he is ignorant of and



inattentive to the duties of his office; that he wants capacity for the office which he holds; and I impeach his integrity and veracity.

I have but one particular more to notice. The letter by me to him, and published in the Telegraph, was intended to be private, and put him on his guard.

It contains no threat, but plainly tells him what I intended to do, and believed I could do. It does not contain a syllable disrespectful towards yourself; but expresses a firm reliance on the propriety with which you will inquire and decide against him. It puts him on his guard against any reliance on your too favorable opinion of him, for I thought it a paramount duty in you to disregard such opinions; and in the present excited state of the country, so firmly am I convinced of being able to sustain the charges I have made, I believe it would lead to unpleasant measures as it respected yourself. Such a communication I should not have made to you, I have not made to the public; if there was any thing offensive in the letter it only became so by its publication, for which Mr. Barry alone is responsible.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

With great respect,

Your ob't Servant,

ABRAHAM BRADLEY.

Since writing the foregoing, I have been informed of allowances made to two contractors for merely expediting the mail, to the amount of nine thousand dollars a year; the alterations would not be estimated of the value of from one fourth to one third of the sum, and of little importance to the public.